DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 294 CE 054 407

AUTHOR Finch, Curtis R.; And Others
TITLE Assessing Leadership Behavior: Beyond Task Analysis.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 89
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the National Association of Industrial Technical Teacher Educators Leadership Development Session, American Vocational Association Convention (Orlando, FL, December 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Evaluation Methods; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Leadership Training; Management Development; Postsecondary Education; *Professional Development; Supervisory Methods; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Behavioral Event Interview

ABSTRACT

This paper asserts that task analysis and related task-based approaches to assessing leadership attributes provide a limited view of how leaders function in educational settings. It proposes that several assessment approaches show promise in identifying vocational education administrator leadership attributes. Strengths and limitations associated with various leadership assessment strategies are examined. Several strategies are discussed that focus on the more subtle aspects of vocational education leadership. Use of one such strategy, the Behavioral Event Interview, is discussed in relation to an ongoing project that seeks better ways to prepare vocational education administrators. Examples of information gathered via personal interviews with practicing administrators are used to highlight the Behavioral Event Interview's utility in applied settings. The paper includes 28 references. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323294

ASSESSING LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR: BEYOND TASK ANALYSIS

Curtis R. Finch
James A. Gregson
Susan L. Faulkner

Virginia Tech Office, National Center for Research in
Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Presentation made at the
NAITTE Leadership Development Session
American Vocational Association Annual Convention
Orlando, Florida

December, 1989

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from The Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Gregson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 054 407

ASSESSING LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR: BEYOND TASK ANALYSIS

Curtis R. Finch, James A. Gregson and Susan L. Faulkner

OVERVIEW

Over the past several years, great concern has been expressed about the preparation of educational administrators. Cunningham (1985), for example, raised a number of significant questions about what it may take to provide meaningful leadership preparation. He noted that in past years "leaders have often simply emerged; they have drifted into positions of leadership or been drafted for leadership roles" (Cunningham, 1985, p. 17). Concern has led to detailed examinations of and recommendations for reform in educational administrator preparation. A report released by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) supported major changes to the field including establishing a clearer definition of what constitutes good educational leadership, developing more relevant preparation programs, improving the administrator selection process, establishing licensing systems, and forming better linkages between educational agencies and universities. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) recently released a report that echoed the need to provide improved school leadership preparation (Shibes, 1988). Recommendations developed by AACTE's Subcommittee on the Preparation of School Administrators focused on the improvement of university preparation programs in the areas of program content, program structure, recruitment and selection, instructional approaches,

student research, professional development programs, and university faculty.

As a subset of educational administration, vocational education administration faces similar challenges in terms of preparing persons who can serve in meaningful leadership roles. And, although it is recognized that professional programs focusing on vocational education administrator preparation have accomplished a great deal, future challenges facing vocational education dictate that administrator preparation processes be examined and refined. If vocational education professionals intend to be prepared for the next decade and beyond, the vocational education administrator preparation process must be examined. The process should begin with determining what constitutes successful administration and extend to the development of innovative instructional sequences that will help prepare future-oriented leaders.

PURPOSE

This presentation is based on the belief that task analysis and related task-based approaches to assessing leadership attributes provide a limited view of how leaders function in educational settings. Our discussion will, therefore, focus on several assessment approaches that show promise in identifying vocational education administrator leadership attributes. Initially, strengths and limitations associated with various leadership assessment strategies are examined. Several strategies are discussed that focus on the more subtle aspects of vocational education leadership. Use of one such strategy, the

Behavioral Event Interview, is discussed in relation to an ongoing National Center for Research in Vocational Education project that seeks better ways to prepare vocational education administrators. Examples of information gathered via personal interviews with practicing administrators and instructors are used to highlight the Behavioral Event Interview's utility in applied settings.

SOME THOUGHTS ON LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT

It would be nice to believe that educational leadership in general and vocational education leadership in particular has become an exact science. Unfortunately, this is only wishful thinking. Although extensive research and experience has provided us with much insight into the leadership process, no standard formula for leadership exists that may be applied to all education settings and situations. In fact, theorists and researchers in this field do not always agree among themselves as to the nature of leadership (Finch & McGough, 1982). Fortunately, several contemporary authors have provided fresh and creative views on this topic that go beyond what may be called undimensional leadership models. Boyatzis (1982), for example, presents a model of individual competence that goes far beyond the basic traits and skills traditionally associated with leadership. Finch and McGough (1982) posit a model for leadership that is multidimensional in scope; one that acknowledges relationships among three dimensions of leadership: the task dimension, the environment dimension, and the human dimension. One aspect of leadership cannot be viewed without

giving consideration to the other two. Moss (1988) provides a framework for leadership that depicts relationships between the leader's and the group's behaviors. He notes that "leaders' specific behaviors are determined by their attributes -- the characteristics, knowledge, and skills --interacting with their perception of group attributes (including culture), the particular tasks at hand, and the general context (Moss, 1988, p. 9-10). In sum, it appears that the leadership process is indeed complex. Thus, leadership is not based solely on successful performance of specific tasks. The assessment of leadership must include strategies that are equipped to gather the subtle relationships existing between leader and group. Such strategies should capture the dynamics of leadership in action instead of just recording step-by-step procedures and processes that are isolated from context. In the section that follows, consideration is given to the potential strengths and, shortcomings of various strategies that have been applied to leadership assessment.

LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES

Although the potential number of strategies one may use to assess leadership is endless, we have chosen to focus on four. These strategies have been used in a number of research and development studies and have been advocated by certain segments of the educational community. The four strategies discussed below include Task Analysis, School Assessment Measures, the DACUM Approach, and the Behavioral Event Interview.

Task Analysis

Few strategies have seen such widespread use as task analysis. This particular approach is used extensively to determine what specific tasks workers perform and often serves as a basis for vocational education course and program content. Essentially, task analysis is defined as "the process wherein tasks performed by workers employed in a particular job are identified and verified" (Finch & Crunkilton, 1989, p. 144). The worker's job includes duties and tasks he or she actually performs. Duties tend to be large segments of work done by an individual and typically serve as broad categories (e.g. human resource development) within which tasks may be placed. Tasks, on the other hand, are work units that form a duty (e.g. hire a new employee, conduct a training program). Each task contains a definite beginning and ending point and usually consists of two or more separate steps. Fundamental to task analysis is the gathering of information directly from job incumbents. Once lists of potential tasks are prepared for a certain job, the lists are shared with workers in that job who are asked to indicate which tasks they perform. The resultant data is used to determine which of the potential tasks are actually performed by workers and to what extent they are performed by members of the group.

Task analysis has several inherent advantages. The task verification process is relatively simple and straightforward. Although the entire analysis is time consuming, potential tasks are fairly easy to identify and, if worded properly, can be

easily understood by job incumbents. As with most quantitative measures, checklists and ratings readily lend themselves to computation of means, percentages, and standard deviations.

It should be noted, however, that task analysis is not without its disadvantages. When task statements are being prepared, it is very easy to exclude items or areas that cut across several tasks or serve as "umbrellas" for a particular set of tasks. Focal areas that might end up "falling through the cracks" between tasks might include values, attitudes, and interpersonal relations. Likewise, focus on the individual worker may limit an analysis in terms of areas such as the employment context, teamwork within this context, and relationships between administrators and others. Although an auto body repairer or welder may sometimes work in relative isolation, the vocational education administrator's involvement with others is an integral part of his or her day-to-day work.

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT MEASURES

In 1966, James Coleman released a now famous study titled Equality of Educational Opportunity (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, & York, 1966). In this study, Coleman and his associates concluded that the effects of the home environment were much more significant in students' achievement than the effects of school programs. The controversy that arose from the Coleman Report stimulated a great deal of research related to school effectiveness. Such major studies as Weber's, Inner-City Children (1971), the New York State Performance Review (Block, 1974), Madden's California School Effectiveness Study

(1976), and Rutter, Mauhan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith's Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children (1979) not only found that some schools did make a difference, but they also noted the principals of schools with high student achievement exhibited certain "leadership" behaviors.

Though the findings of these and numerous other studies (i.e., Greenfield, 1982; Yukl, 1981) are quite similar, the procedures that were implemented to collect the data for these studies varied greatly. For example, Weber (1971) identified four inner-city elementary schools in New York, Los Angeles, and Kansas City that were primarily comprised of lower socio-economic students who consistently read above the national reading norms. In The California School Effectiveness Study, Madden (1976) identified 21 pairs of elementary schools that matched on the basis of pupil characteristics but whose students differed on standardized achievement measures. Rutter and his colleagues (1979) observed, interviewed, and surveyed 1500 junior high school students in 12 London inner-city schools. This longitudinal study examined students' standardized test scores when the students entered the schools and compared them to their scores when the students exited the schools three years later.

Sweeny's (1982) research synthesis of effective school leadership studies provides evidence that schools are most frequently assessed as effective when their students display a marked increase on standardized test scores after entering that particular school. Sweeney also made a convincing argument that the majority of these studies seem to effectively control for the

students' socio-economic-status. However, other assessment measures have also been used to indicate effectiveness. Low rates of vandalism and absenteeism, low staff turnover, low student drop-out rate, and community involvement have all been utilized to indicate school effectiveness (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

The Louisiana School Effectiveness Study also provides evidence which supports the contention that schools, not just the socio-economic-status of students, strongly influence student achievement. In this study, Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) found that 13% of the explained variance among students' performance on norm referenced achievement tests could be attributed to the individual school. Stringfield and Teddlie also found a tremendous difference in principals' performance at effective schools as compared to principals' performance at ineffective schools. Teachers at effective schools described their principals as hard working, supportive, and involved in ongoing classroom processes. In contrast, teachers at ineffective schools described their principals as passive, having a lack of vision or passion, and engaging in behavior which seemed to convey the message that their task is somewhat futile.

In highlights from research on effective school leadership, Block (1983) reported that effective schools have effective leaders. This research brief states that principals of effective schools emphasize achievement, set instructional strategies, provide an orderly atmosphere, frequently evaluate student progress, coordinate instructional programs, and support teachers

(pp. 25-29). Though few would argue that this list of rather vague behaviors is not important to administrative leadership, there has been much criticism of effective school research. For example, Rowan, Bossert, and Dwyer (1983) contend that the definition of school effectiveness often is based solely on instructional outcomes instead of also including other educational objectives. In addition, Rowan et al., pointed out that research studies have not been consistent in how they have defined instructional outcomes (i.e., absolute measures of instructional outcomes, standardized test scores).

Although the notion of using school effectiveness as a basis for locating outstanding school administrators and consequently identifying their leadership skills shows some promise, its application to vocational education settings has many potential problems. Murphy (1988) argued that many of the samples used in effective schools research studies are inadequate. He suggested that studies sampling only one or two grade levels and focusing on reading or math scores, present an incomplete picture of schools' achievement outcomes. Murphy also pointed out that much of the research has ignored the possibility that substantial differences in school size could influence behaviors deemed effective by the principal. Similarly, Rowan, Bossert, and Dwyer (1983) stated that the tendency for effective school studies to examine urban schools serving poor children severely limit the generalizability of research findings.

The methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems that Murphy (1988) and Rowan, Bossert, and Dwyer (1983) discuss

concerning the effective schools research on general education are especially troublesome when one attempts to apply the effective schools research model to vocational education. First, although there has been a recent emphasis on integrating basic skills instruction in vocational education, it is questionable whether standardized mathematics and reading examinations by themselves or in concert adequately assess vocational education effectiveness. Second, with perhaps the exception of programs such as cosmetology, plumbing, welding, and health occupations, which provide certification opportunities, there are a limited number of standardized examinations available to assess program effectiveness, much less school effectiveness. Third, although many vocational programs are required to report their placement rates, the argument could easily be made that extraneous variables such as a community's economy have a larger role in determining the placement rate than the skills learned by students through participation in a particular program. Even though school assessment measures show promise as a means of identifying leadership behavior, this process is, at present, most fully developed in relation to elementary schools and comprehensive high schools. Hopefully, the development and refinement of assessment measures will enable us to move beyond general assessment and into more specific areas that are more closely aligned with vocational education.

DACUM Approach

The DACUM (Developing A CurriculUM) approach utilizes some basic ideas associated with task analysis but has its own unique

character. DACUM relies on experts employed in a particular occupational area to identify what skills are important and allows them to be guided through a systematic identification process. The DACUM approach involves using a committee of eight to twelve resource persons who are experts in a particular occupation. The committee functions as a group with all developmental activities taking place when the members are together. A coordinator from outside the group works with the committee to facilitate the development process (Norton, 1985). Examples of previously developed DACUM charts and related materials may be provided to committee members so they can see what an end product of their efforts will look like. The facilitator guides the committee through a series of steps that include reviewing a written description of the specific occupation, identifying general areas of competence and specific skills or behaviors for each area of competence, structuring the skills into a meaningful learning sequence, and establishing a level of competence for each skill as related to realistic work situations (Finch & Crunkilton, 1989, p. 140). The end result of this coordinated effort is a skill profile that can serve as both curriculum plan and evaluation instrument for an employment preparation program.

The DACUM approach has a large number of supporters. It is a relatively fast way of obtaining meaningful information about important skills needed by workers because the process may take as little as two to four days. This approach has, in fact, been used by Norton, Ross, Garcia, and Hobart (1977) to identify

duties and tasks performed by vocational education administrators. Norton (1988, p. 55) noted that in both the 1977 study and a 1987 update study by Norton and Harrington, (1987), DACUM was found to be a most satisfactory approach. He indicated that DACUM provided for the identification of general knowledge and skills required; work traits and attitudes; and tools, equipment, and supplies necessary to the job.

The DACUM approach does, however, appear to have several limitations. Although the process can include probing of experts' minds to identify what they believe, this information tends to exclude the context or contexts within which experts' thoughts and feelings occur. Furthermore, although the group process may facilitate establishment of expert consensus, a lack of careful monitoring may result in a loss of information about the subtle differences among experts' perceptions of a particular setting or situation. The DACUM approach may thus be viewed as an important yet not all-inclusive way to gather meaningful information about skills, knowledges, and other components of the vocational administrator's job.

Behavioral Event Interview

The Behavioral Event Interview (BEI) was developed by Harvard Professor David McClelland (1978) and colleagues at McBer and Company. It is based on the Critical Incident Technique that was created many years ago by John Flanagan (1954). McClelland labels his form of critical-incident interviewing Behavioral Event Interviewing because it produces a detailed description of key events the interviewee has experienced while on the job. The

Behavioral Event Interview has been used in a wide variety of settings. For instance, McBer has used the Behavioral Event Interview to study such industrial and government organizations as the U. S. Navy, the U. S. Department of Transportation, Mattel, and Monsanto (Boyatzis, 1982). Some studies which have utilized the Behavioral Event Interview have conducted over 2,000 interviews (Boyatzis, 1982), while others have used fewer than 40 (see for example Huff, Lake, & Schaalman, 1982; Mentkowski, O'Brien, McEachern, and Fowler, 1982).

The Behavioral Event Interview is frequently utilized because of its ability to differentiate those characteristics possessed by more successful leaders from those characteristics possessed by less successful leaders. Persons categorized according to their success are interviewed by a skilled interviewer who employs journalistic inquiry techniques to identify what behaviors each individual displays during a series of key or critical events. The interviewer asks each respondent to describe events where he or she felt particularly effective on the job and as well as events in which the person felt ineffective. As in the use of traditional open questions, the interviewer utilizes probing and funnelling to acquire greater specificity and clarity. Though the Behavioral Event Interview is usually recorded, Boyatzis (1982) states that the interviewer should still take notes so later coding of the interview will be clearer. As with other moderately structured interviews, the interviewer may also take notes to assist in the development of probing questions. After the interview is

conducted, a write-up is performed for each event. A write-up often describes the situation, who was involved, the behavior of the respondent (or person of interest), the respondent's thoughts and feelings, the outcome, and the writer's perceptions.

A major advantage of the Behavioral Event Interview is that the interviewer gains access not only to those behaviors that are relevant to the study, but also to their contexts. This is in contrast with participant observation where the researcher may observe a situation for a long period of time and still not observe all the behaviors of interest. Another advantage the Behavioral Event Interview has over participant observation is that it can capture the thoughts and feelings of the administrator. Attaining an administrator's thoughts and feelings is sometimes difficult to accomplish when one shadows an administrator in a school for a number of days. Thus, the Behavioral Event Interview is an efficient method of collecting data since it may be used to obtain a representative sample of the person's behavior on the job. Because of this characteristic, Boyatzis maintains that the Behavioral Event Interview can be considered a content-valid assessment method.

As Boyatzis (1982) points out, one shortcoming of the BEI is that it depends on the memory of the respondent. Thus, there is a possibility that the information gathered will be selective and biased. However, Klemp (1979) and Boyatzis (1982) maintain that with the use of extensive probing, the interviewer can record the behaviors that were actually performed in the event, rather than biased recollections of the behaviors. Because of this need for

extensive probing, Mentkowski, McEachern, O'Brien, and Fowler (1984) recommend using the Behavioral Event Interview with a trained interviewer, as opposed to asking a respondent to write the information on a mail survey. Thus, another disadvantage of the Behavioral Event Interview is its cost. Interviewers must undergo an extensive training program and travel is often required to conduct the interviews. Travel expense is a crucial factor when the study dictates selecting a representative sample of people to interview.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Each of the aforementioned strategies has its own strengths and limitations. For example, task analysis is a superior tool when used to identify specific tasks and skills associated with an occupation but falls somewhat short of the mark in assessing what goes on within the dynamic workplace. The behavioral event interview gives consideration to contexts within which leadership behaviors occur but does so at a relatively high cost because of the need for very skilled interviewers. The DACUM approach, on the other hand, is relatively inexpensive to use. This is especially true when consideration is given to the amount of useful information DACUM produces. However, certain aspects of the DACUM approach tend to limit its effectiveness in identifying and verifying some of the more subtle aspects of leadership. Finally, the use of school assessment measures is perhaps most sound from a theoretical standpoint but raises a host of methodological questions when applied to vocational education administration.

Perhaps the best way of viewing these assessment approaches is in terms of their specific uses and strengths. In other words, there is no single approach that is in itself adequate. Even if efficiency and cost were no object, there is no one approach that can be used to assess the entire spectrum of leadership behavior. When designing leadership assessment activities, it is thus best to consider using two or more approaches, choosing those that complement each other and collectively to obtain a broad band of leadership information that ranges from specific administrator tasks to subtle leadership behaviors and contexts. It is only in this way that leadership behavior may be assessed in a comprehensive manner.

APPLICATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL EVENT INTERVIEWING

During the first phase of our NCRVE funded Vocational Education Administrator Project, we are seeking to identify leadership abilities associated with effective vocational education administration. Based on this study, we will propose instructional sequences that prepare persons to function as successful administrators. This project provides direct support for the leadership development service function of the National Center. Leadership attributes being identified through the field study will be utilized to modify and strengthen the delivery of leadership development services. These empirical results are among the first to be obtained from the actual performance of vocational administrators.

A description of the first phase of this project follows. The interviewer training, sample selection, interviewing process,

interview schedules, administrator interviews, and instructor interviews are detailed. Further, examples of information gathered during our interviews are provided.

Interviewer Training

As noted earlier, the Behavior Event Interview process demands that interviewers be highly skilled in conducting interviews. Project interviewers thus underwent extensive training. The training was initiated by conducting several pilot interviews in designated pilot test states (Virginia and West Virginia). Then, a specialist in the Behavioral Event Interview process conducted an interviewer training session for project staff. Training in the general principles for behavioral event interviewing included the principles for probe questions and the principles for building rapport. The training schedule included critiques of interview tapes completed prior to the training session, role play interviews, interviewer self-assessment, specialist feedback, and consensus feedback.

Sample

The sample of states was selected from among those who have well-developed secondary and/or postsecondary vocational education programs. Criteria used for the selection of the sample of states included (a) secondary and postsecondary vocational enrollments, (b) total student population of post-secondary institutions, (c) percent of operating income received from the state level, (d) vocational allotments for program year 1989, and (e) number of administrators in the administrator affiliate in the American Vocational Association. A total of

seven states was selected in the sample. These states included Georgia, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

Interview Process

Interviews were conducted at three levels in each of the selected states. First, selected individuals at the state department of education level were contacted by telephone. These persons were asked to confirm the number of secondary or postsecondary institutions located in the state and the data used in identifying the state. If the information was confirmed, face-to-face interviews were arranged and then conducted with the chief administrative officer responsible for secondary and/or postsecondary vocational education and his or her staff members. These individuals were asked to nominate four to eight individuals, who have had at least three years of experience as administrators, that they perceived as the most successful secondary/postsecondary vocational administrators in the state. Furthermore, they were asked to focus on successful line administrators who had overall responsibility managing an institution and to give due consideration to persons from both resource-rich and resource-poor locations. Finally, they were each asked to identify some examples of the nominees' success. Data from state-level interviews in each state were tabulated to determine which local-level administrators had been nominated the greatest number of times by state staff and, therefore, would be selected for an interview. Two to seven administrators were selected to be interviewed in each state.

After the tabulation of nominations from state staff, each of the nominated local-level vocational administrators was contacted by telephone to schedule a convenient time for a telephone interview. A letter was sent to each local-level vocational administrator contacted by telephone to confirm the date and time of the interview and to present this person with an overview of the project. At the conclusion of each interview, the interviewer asked the administrator for the names and telephone numbers of three male and three female instructors who had been at their institution for at least three years and representing a range of occupational technical teaching areas. The administrator understood that at least two of these instructors would be contacted by telephone and interviewed by a project staff member.

Finally, the interviewers contacted at least two of the instructors, who worked with the nominated administrators, and telephone interviews were scheduled. Again, letters were sent to each of the instructors scheduled to be interviewed to confirm the date and time of the interview and to present them with an overview of the project.

After each interview was conducted, the interviewer completed a write-up for each event. The write-up was prepared in first person and read like a story telling what actually happened during each event. The purpose of the interview write-up was to organize and present the interview transcript and note taking information in a more easily understandable sequence and format. Even though each interview was recorded and transcripts

of the interview tapes were provided, the write-up provided researchers with meaningful information that had been carefully organized to better facilitate analysis and coding. Information contained in the write-up was organized into "situation," "who was involved," "behavior," "thoughts/feelings," "outcome," and "writer comments" (Mentkowski, McEachern, O'Brien, & Fowler, 1982).

Interview Schedules

To insure uniformity of information collected during each interview, interview schedules were developed and pilot tested. The four interview schedules used by the interviewers included (a) an interview schedule confirming information obtained about the state, (b) a state department of education/board of regents interview schedule, (c) an administrator interview schedule, and (d) an instructor interview schedule.

Administrator Interviews

The first section of the administrator interview schedule requested information about each administrator's typical work day. Then, the administrator was asked to recall three incidents or events, two with which the administrator was very pleased and one that, thanks to the power of hindsight, the administrator would act differently if a similar situation occurred again. In this part of the interview, no detail was too insignificant to mention since we wanted a very detailed description of the event.

For the first two events, each administrator was asked to think of a time that he or she felt particularly effective. This would be a time he or she felt something was accomplished and a

time the administrator felt particularly good about his or her leadership. To provide an idea of the way information can unfold during one of these interviews, here is an extract from an event that was taken directly from a write-up. It describes a particular situation and behavior of the administrator.

> Because of coming into the district as a new person, I had a short period of time before the media were interested in the new person on the block. Visibility was reinforced through recognition of the name of our institution, and that reinforcement lead to more behavior like that which was positively reinforced. A lot of newspaper stories, a lot of television coverage, and a lot of legislative interest began to feed upon itself.
>
> As a consequence of the media being interested in me as a new person, I was able to capture their interest and then maintain their attention. For example, I probably serve on eight or nine boards of directors. This enabled the district to have visibility within the power structure.
>
> If one of the employees at the institution was appointed to a committee, we generated news releases to the press about this individual's appointment. As more and more of our people began to do more things, the institution received more media coverage. More coverage generated more interest, and more interest generated more coverage. All of our employees are now involved. Getting our name out before the public is very important.

I used several ways to gain media coverage of myself. For example, an articulation council was created among all of the secondary schools in the district. Three or four television stations covered the meeting of this council at this institution.

Each administrator was also asked to describe an incident or event, which due to the power of hindsight, his or her behavior would be altered. An example of an event as described by an administrator follows.

> I won the battle, but lost the war in working with colleagues several times that simply did not work. In other words, winning a personal attack on a peer over the long run did more harm than good. It takes several years to undo the damage that has been done.
>
> For example, I remember being in a cabinet meeting and being very upset with a peer. I criticized the peer in front of other peers. I expressed disappointment in his performance and in his handling of a situation. Then, later I realized the damage that I had done. It took about seven, eight, or nine months before I realized it.
>
> When the colleague told me how he felt following the attack before his peers, it was a realization of a style that I had practiced that was inappropriate and ineffective. I had a feeling of awareness and realization of the impact. This understanding caused a behavior change.

Instructor Interviews

The first section of the instructor interview schedule asked each instructor to name abilities that would be most important to look for in a person applying for an administrative position. Then, the instructor was asked to describe the abilities that his or her administrator possessed. The secord section of the interview scheduled asked the instructor to recall two incidents or events it was believed his or her administrator demonstrated successful leadership capabilities. This was a time the instructor believed that the administrator was particularly effective. Again, the instructor was asked to provide a very detailed description of the event.

In more than on instance, the administrator and the instructor would tell the interviewer about the same event. The previous example of an administrator describing image enhancement for the institution was also described by an instructor. The instructor's thoughts and feelings, as they appeared on the write-up, follow.

> This is really paying off in terms of image enhancement and awareness in the community concerning what this school is all about. I feel the administrator has done a tremendous job by pulling together the forces already on campus and coordinating them into a real marketing effort. I feel the administrator took this as a leader-ship challenge and succeeded. The faculty are generally pleased with the visibility and image enhancement because it has given them more prestige in the eyes of their

peers. I think this administrator feels "good" about what has been done. This individual continues to work at it. It is not something that is just done once.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The need to prepare vocational education administrators who will be capable of facing tomorrow's challenges is indeed clear. Persons must be available who can demonstrate effective leadership in a variety of situations and settings. Preparing these individuals begins with the assessment of administrative leadership behavior and extends to the inclusion and use of relevant instructional sequences in administrator preparation programs.

It has been indicated that assessment approaches are available to gather meaningful leadership information; however, each of these approaches has, in addition to its strengths, one or more limitations. Hopefully, future assessments of leadership behavior will take these strengths and limitations into consideration with an end result being the assembly of leadership information that reflects the dynamic, multidimensional nature of vocational administrators' work.

References

Block, A. W. (1983). Effective schools: A summary of research. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). The competent manager: A model for effective performance. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Cunningham, L. L. (1985, September). Leaders and leadership: 1985 and beyond. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 17-20.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. Psychological Bulletin, 51(4), 327-358.

Finch, C. R., & Crunkilton, J. R. (1989). Curriculum development in vocational education, (3rd edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Finch, C. R., & McGough, R. L. (1982). Administering and supervising occupational education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Greenfield, W. D. (1982, October). Research on public school principals: A review and recommendations. Paper prepared for the National Conference on the Principalship, convened by the National Institute of Education.

Huff, S., Lake, D., & Schaalman, M. L. (1982). Principal differences: Excellence in school leadership and management. Boston, MA: McBer.

Klemp, G. O. (1979). Job competence assessment. Boston, MA: McBer.

Madden, J. V. (1976). School effectiveness study. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

McClelland, D. C. (1978). Guide to behavioral event interviewing. Boston, MA: McBer.

Mentkowski, M., O'Brien, K., McEachern, W., & Fowler, D. (1982). Developing a professional competence model for management education. Milwaukee: Alverno College Productions.

Moss, J. (1988). Leadership Development and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. St. Paul: University of Minnesota Office, National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Murphy, J. (1988). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(1), 117-139.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for American schools. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Norton, R. E. (1985). DACUM handbook. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Norton, R. E. (1988). Reaction to Moss's "Clues about skills and characteristics that distinguish high-performing vocational administrators." Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 26(2), 53-59.

Norton, R. E., & Harrington, L. G. (1987). Administrator competency study, RD #268. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Norton, R. E., Ross, K. L., Garcia, G., & Hobart B. (1977). The identification and rational verification of competencies important to secondary and postsecondary administrators of vocational administration. Columbus, OH: The Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Rowan, B., Bossert, S. T., & Dwyer, D. C. (1983, April). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. Educational Researcher, 12, 24-31.

Russell, J. S., Mazzarella, J. A., White, T., & Maurer, S. (1985). Linking the behaviors and activities of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Rutter, M., Mauhan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shibles, M. R. (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1988, October). A time to summarize: The Louisiana school effectiveness study. Educational Leadership, Vol. 45, 43-49.

Sweeney, J. (1982, February). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 39, 346-352.

Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Yukl, G. (1981). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.